

Statement of Dr. E.L. Wynder, 1967 Senate Hearings.

34

Dr. Moore.

Dr. Ernst L. Wynder, associate member, Cancer Research.

Mr. C. Your entire statement will appear in record as you wish.

BY DR. WYNDER

For 15 years, I have been engaged in epidemiological studies of cancer, including that of the upper respiratory tracts. Within the framework of these studies and I have paid particular attention to the relationship of tobacco to the development of cancer in man and animal.

I am pleased to attend these Senate Commerce Committee hearings toward a less-hazardous cigarette, one that is acceptable to the American public and one in which

the National Committee on Smoking and Health is contributing significantly to ill health in connection with cancer of the upper respiratory tracts, chronic bronchitis and emphysema, and lung cancer. The committee summarized its findings that cigarette smoking is a health hazard of sufficient magnitude to warrant appropriate remedial action. The General's Report on the health consequences of smoking has expanded on the basic conclusions of the

epidemiological studies carried out at the Sloan-Kettering Institute which are in full agreement with these conclusions of the mouth, esophagus, larynx, lung, and stomach. Studies at our institute, and those by other investigators, support to epidemiological findings by showing that tobacco condensate can produce cancer in a variety of

animals. Before this committee is whether the harmful effects of smoking can be diminished by the development of a safer cigarette. This subject falls into the category of research that is being carried out by the Surgeon General's Report of 1964. Our research in our laboratory has been directed toward the carcinogenic, ciliotoxic, and mucous-coagulating properties of tobacco smoke, and the particulate phase of tobacco smoke. We have reviewed our data and those of other investigators which we are submitting for your attention. I have included detailed data indicating how specific carcinogenic agents can be reduced, in the one case by a modification of the tobacco plant, and in the other by altering the combustion process. We suggest various methods that may be used to reduce the carcinogenicity and toxicity of cigarette smoke, at the experimental setting. You will note it includes treatment of tobacco, tobacco additives, blend-

35

ing, proportions of tobacco, homogenized leaf, stems, tobacco cut, porous paper, smoke filtration. Modifications in the tobacco selection, tobacco treatment, as well as a selective reduction through additives, use of tobacco sheets, and its optimum cut-packing-density ratio.

We have been concerned with the reduction of ciliotoxic agents through tobacco selection, selective filtration, and modification of combustion.

Some of these steps are too technical to be detailed here, but certainly there is a wide range of possible procedures. Although it still needs to be established that these measures will reduce adverse effects on man, there is general agreement about the desirability of an overall reduction of particulate matter from the smoke of cigarettes. Such a reduction can certainly be accomplished today by using selected tobacco strains and reconstituted tobaccos, enhanced combustion, as well as by utilizing effective filters.

Our studies have shown that the greater the number of cigarettes smoked by an individual, the greater his risk of being adversely affected by smoking. The data on figure 1 shows the results of a study we have conducted at the institute. You will note the risk of the individuals smoking less than 10 cigarettes is relatively small, and this is a point that was already made by previous speakers. You will also note that the risk to pipe and cigar smokers is relatively low, we believe due to the fact that cigar and pipe smokers but rarely inhale.

It should be noted, however, that a specific threshold level at which no risk occurs cannot be deduced from the data. A dose response to tobacco smoke condensate has also been shown by animal studies, figure 2, and these data will closely correspond to those data just shown by Dr. Moore.

I agree with the conclusions of the Surgeon General's Report of 1964, that "there is a preponderance of evidence that the tar and nicotine levels represent an adequate measure of dosage," and that a reduction in dosage is likely to be followed by a reduction in risk.

Upon examining the "tar" and nicotine yields of filter and nonfilter cigarettes, we and other investigators have found significant differences between various American cigarettes. Although the smoke condensate yield of some filter cigarettes is relatively low, a few yield as much as or even more "tar" and nicotine than nonfilter cigarettes. One certainly should expect filter cigarettes to be lower in the yield of "tar" and nicotine than nonfilter cigarettes. The effect of selective reduction of some gaseous components by certain filter materials, a reduction which we and others have shown to be quite feasible, is difficult to evaluate at this time since evidence of the effectiveness of such measures is based entirely on animal experiments. As may be expected theoretically, the selective removal of carcinogenic aromatic hydrocarbons is not possible by filtration alone, as has been shown by extensive studies done in our and other laboratories.

The effect of enhanced combustion is also measured at present entirely in the experimental setting. Nevertheless, it appears important to reduce substances, such as polynuclear aromatic hydrocarbons, that have been found to be environmental carcinogens to man and more complete combustion of tobacco is one step that will contribute to this end. One way in which my associate, Dr. Hoffmann, and I have been

1005072785